

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the Japanese Patent 09-153250 to Teichu. In addition, claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Teichu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,470,435 to Yamamoto et al. Further, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Teichu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,206 to Seki. Finally, claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Teichu in view of Japanese Published Application No. 10134470 to Inoue.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite a reproducing means, "wherein, upon receipt of a reproduction command, said reproducing means detects a head block number and any subsequent block numbers stored in said nonvolatile memory corresponding to the desired data to be reproduced, and wherein said desired data is reproduced from the disk-shaped medium simultaneously with the detection of said subsequent block numbers." As best understood, in explaining the above rejection of claim 1, the Examiner relies on Teichu to teach the reproducing means; in rejecting claims 2-8 the Examiner relies on Yamamoto, Seki, or Inoue to teach other features specified in the claims. It is respectfully submitted that the English Abstract of Teichu does not teach the reproducing means recited in claim 1, as amended. [remember to change this section as per Dennis] Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the English Abstract of Teichu and is allowable. Further, claims 2-8 which depend from claim 1 are allowable therewith. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-8 be withdrawn.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is a basis for a contrary view.

### **CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to  
Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By:

  
Samuel H. Megerditchian  
Reg. No. 45,678  
Tel. (212) 588-0800